205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in the gallery to turn off laptop computers, cell phones, and pagers. And we ask the guests in the gallery to rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield."

Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and most kind God, the Creator of us all, for it is from... from You for which all of our help come. And it is from You, God, from which all Your blessings do flow. We pray today, God, that You would look upon this august Assembly that is gathered here. And with Your favor I ask that You would direct us in all of our actions, that You will grant to us vigilant hearts, that You would give us minds to know You, that You would give us the diligence to seek You and grant to us a wisdom to find You. I pray that You will sanctify and cleanse us with Your presence. I ask that You would bless us with Your might. I ask that You will assist us with Your great counsel. I pray that all of our endeavors, that they begin with You and that they end with You. the end of this day all praise will belong to You. This we pray in Your Son's name. Amen."

Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

- one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Hernandez and McGuire are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect all Republicans are present and ready to do the work of the people."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please add Representative Brosnahan to the list of excused absences."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative, we're advised that Mr. Brosnahan is on his way to Springfield, that he will be late but that he will be in attendance. The Clerk shall take the record. There being 114 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on January 09, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for House Bill 1841, referred to Second Reading and House Bill 2482 referred to Second Reading. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 09, 2008, reported the

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass for House Bill 4163. Short Debate' Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 09, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' Senate Bill 437. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on January 09, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Bill 4191."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rose."

"Merry New Year, Mr. Speaker. I'm actually rising to give my personal thanks to you and to Leader Cross, and to this Body, for the FutureGen legislation that was passed last summer. As many of you know and some of you may not know, Illinois was victorious over Texas in landing the first of its kind FutureGen plant. This plant will mean over a thousand (1,000) jobs to our state, and more specifically, to my district. And we had a good and vibrant discussion last spring and summer and it ultimately yielded a piece of legislation and... that helped us bring FutureGen here to Illinois. I just wanted to say my sincere thanks to everyone in this room who helped with that legislation, but also, and frankly more importantly, I want to give my thanks to both Tuscola and to Mattoon. Our local communities put forth an incredible effort to put them in the running to begin with and then ultimately to

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

bring this project to Illinois. And I could not be more proud of the truly team effort from the bottom up in Mattoon and Tuscola, all the way to the Governor's Office, that this has been. And I just wanted to say a word of thanks to all Members of this Body who helped help with that."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, do you have a Resolution?"

- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 889, offered by Representative Stephens.
  - WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are pleased to recognize one of our own, State Representative Jim Watson, for his service to our country; and
  - WHEREAS, Representative Jim Watson believes in his heart the words of President John F. Kennedy, who said: "One man can make a difference and every man should try"; and
  - WHEREAS, Representative Watson cites the heroism of our war heroes throughout American history, including Sergeant Sammy L. Davis, recipient of the Medal of Honor for valorous conduct while serving in the United States Army during the Vietnam War, and Colonel Joshua Chamberlain, recipient of the Medal of Honor for his gallantry in command of the 20th Maine Infantry at the Battle of Gettysburg during the Civil War; and
  - WHEREAS, Representative Watson was a member of the United States Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserves from 1985 until 1991, serving in Iraq during Operation Desert Storm from 1990 to 1991; and

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

- WHEREAS, Representative Watson believes that there is a general sense of duty that does not end when one takes the uniform off; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Watson re-enlisted last May as an E-6 Staff Sergeant in the United States Marine Corps Reserves and was attached to the Civil Affairs Group (CAG) at Camp Pendleton, California; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Watson is set to deploy to Iraq next month as a member of the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force's (I MEF) Headquarters Unit; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Watson will be serving in Fallujah in Al-Anbar province as part of the Unit's Governance Cell, where he will be working with the local population to build provincial and municipal governments; and
- WHEREAS, To achieve this objective, Representative Watson's unit will focus on tribal engagement working with the existing tribes in the region to form functioning democratic governments; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Watson is a citizen soldier, a concept which our Founding Fathers strongly believed in; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Watson is making a sacrifice for our country and for our freedom and is setting a great example for the next generation of Americans; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Watson himself stated: "If thousands of service men and women with jobs and families back home can go to Iraq, how can it be wrong for an elected official to step up and serve?"; and

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

- WHEREAS, Representative Watson will be leaving behind his three loving children, ages 9, 13, and 16, and stated that his family was his main concern upon receiving word he was headed to Iraq; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we honor Representative Jim Watson for his service to our country; that he has our full support as he leaves this august body to begin his tour-of-duty; and that we will work to ensure the interests of his constituents are heard while he is away; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That suitable copies of this resolution be presented to Representative Jim Watson and his family as a symbol of our appreciation and respect."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you and Mr. Mapes for your accommodations in allowing us to deal with this Resolution on short notice. We appreciate accommodation. John Kennedy, said: 'One man can make a difference and every man should try.' And if you've ever been on the stump with Representative Watson as historian, someone who took those words to heart, someone who to this day, lives by that sense of honor. Some people public positions like ours like to talk about leadership; while others talk, Jim Watson leads. Jim is going to Irag for one reason, because America is there. There's a job to be done. He knows that he belongs next to his Marines in harm's way because Jim Watson is, above all, an American Marine. We should all be proud of the

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

commitment that he has made. Regrettably, some will never understand why Jim is doing what he's doing and why he would choose to make such a sacrifice, but we should all be able to identify with it. Too often those in positions of influence or authority do everything they can in their power to assure that they never wear our nation's uniform and that their family never serve. Like many of you, I ache for the day when our country made a commitment that everyone step forward. Regrettably, it's been generations since someone has taken the steps that Representative Jim Watson takes today. Every American and every politician should sacrifice in a time of war. Jim Watson knows that. Rather than debate it or discuss it, he is letting his actions speak for him. We are proud of you, Jim Watson. We are witness to your historic action and we are better for it. America is better for it. And John F. Kennedy would be proud of you today. We wish you Godspeed. solemnly pledge to you that you will be in our thoughts and prayers on a daily basis and we are anxious for your return. And we will celebrate that day with you. So, we wish you Godspeed, Jim. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that leave of the Body that all Members be added as cosponsors. And I would be sure to invite all of you to Brown's tonight at 6:00 where we will be in a celebrative mood. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this Body all respects Jim Watson for what he's doing. When Jimmy first came to the General Assembly and he was my seatmate, finding out he

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

was also a Marine caused for a lot of fun conversations. But when you talked to Jim about his service one thing you can tell is that... if needed he's more than willing to continue to serve and that's what he's proving by this. He knows what his job is. He knows what needs to be done. We're going to miss him around here for the two hundred (200) and many days that he will be gone, but we do look forward to the time he comes back and to hear of the positive side of the adventure that the United States Marine Corps is sending him on. So, to my friend, Representative Jim Watson, and to a Marine Staff Sergeant Jim Watson, we wish you well. We'll do what we have to here to help you in any way possible. Look forward to tonight with you and look forward to that first day when you're back as well. God bless you. Semper Fi."

Speaker Madigan: "Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Staff Sergeant Watson, it's been many, many years since I wore the dress blues of the United States Marine Corps. I am very proud of what you're going to accomplish and what your intentions are. You know, once a Marine always a Marine. And we all truly believe that. Jim, you're being sent to do a task that I know you believe in. And like Mike said, I'm looking forward to hearing what you see and what you find out on those shores. I wish you Godspeed as well. And may God hold you and your company in the palm of His hand. We're proud of you. Hurry back. Semper Fi."

Speaker Madigan: "Bill Mitchell."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I... the three (3) previous speakers are members of the Armed Services, two (2) Marines and Representative Stephens in the Army. I speak today, as Representative Watson he is one of my best I certainly am going to miss him for the next nine (9) months when he's away serving his country. One of the things that I know as one of the 118 Members of this House, this is one of the greatest honors to serve in the House of Representatives. What's a greater honor is to be a citizen of the United States. I think that. I believe But Representative Watson, my friend, he practices that. He's put his life on the line to serve his country. I know Representative Watson and I know his great love is for his country, but also his family. So, I know what a sacrifice it's going to be and he's going to be leaving his children Katie, Jacob, Lexi. I've seen him firsthand of what a good father he is to those three (3) children. I know his love for his family and his love for his country. I will miss Representative Watson. We'll be here to help him in his 97th District. I want to tell him, I love you Jim, and I appreciate what you're doing for this country. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Every so often our country asks that we send some of our best and brightest to serve. Thus it has always been and as I get older, I'm afraid thus it will always be. I think in this case the Commandant of the Corps has certainly taken one of the best, if not the best,

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Legislators I have ever had the privilege of serving with. One of the best human beings I've ever known to do a job, a difficult job, one that many of us would not be perhaps as willing to take on as Jim Watson has been. A job that, if he performs anywhere near the level of expertise and energy and creativity we've all witnessed since he has been in this Body, will bear fruit. And may bear fruit in a long period of time where Jim and his comrades in arms may make a significant difference in a very volatile part of the So, we're sending one of our best. As I left a message for Jim the other day, I hope this General Assembly can prove itself worthy of the sacrifices of so many of our sons and daughters, grandsons, and granddaughters, uncles, aunts, what have you... who have answered their country's call. But I hope we'll prove ourselves worthy of having one of our own spend active duty time in Iraq, trying to rebuild that country's basic government, infrastructure, and the other things that will hopefully, let them enjoy what so many of us take for granted. This is a tremendous sacrifice he's making. It will not be easy on him, certainly not easy for his children. It will not be easy for his constituents. They will miss him, but I know many of us stand ready to help him in any way we can while he is serving us. I think perhaps if we could, a lesson to be learned from his service and the sacrifice that he willingly making, is that we rededicate ourselves to making 2008 a year in which we perhaps could send a message to the people of Iraq trying to build a basic government structure. We can do a much better job than we've done.

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

So let's put 2007 behind us, delightful year that it was, and wish all of us a happy new year and perhaps show that not only will we be concerned about Sergeant Watson and his tour, but we're concerned about doing some of the very things he's going to Iraq to do and that we begin the process of working together and bringing about necessary and needed changes in our state, as Jim will be trying so hard to do in the nation of Iraq. Jim, we wish you Godspeed. We appreciate your service more than words can adequately express. Advice that my father said he heard during World War II, keep your head down, do your job, come home safely. And until that day, my friend, we will keep you in our thoughts and prayers, and we will certainly do everything we can to help... however you want us to help while you're gone. Thank you for your service. Thank you for being the kind of man that you are. look forward to some very interesting stories and perhaps, lessons to be learned upon your return."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. We all have the privilege of serving with Representative Watson here in the House of Representatives. I have the additional privilege of sharing a Senate district with Representative Watson. And in fact, we have one county that we share in common. And I can say that as we all know that means that I see him on a more regular basis than most people probably here in the Legislature do. We're in meetings together. We try to solve problems that are common to our region together. And I'm very proud of

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

the work that Representative Watson has done for our part of the state. He's always one who comes to the meetings prepared to work. He's very straightforward with his views. He says what he means. He means what he says. we know that we can work with him to try find a solution as opposed to simply posturing about, you know, what might be a political answer to an important problem. So, let me say to you, Jim, that I know most of your district. represented all of it at one point. I'm certainly going to work with your constituents to make sure that your interests are represented here on this House Floor. We all wish that you were here, but we understand the decision that you've made and that the obligation that you are under. We certainly respect that. And we honor you in your absence, but most of all, I think we all look forward... we all look forward to that day when you will rejoin us here on the House of Representative Floor. So, good-bye, good luck and we'll meet you again in a little while. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that Mr. Hannig spoke. I was going to say... I didn't want Representative Watson to leave here thinking this was a partisan issue, because it's not. But I just want to say... the reason I'm taking the time to say what I'm saying for your ears, whether it was in the record or not, is because I'm learning as I get older, tomorrow definitely is not promised to us. Today is what we're faced with. Today we made it, by God's permission, but I want you to know that I

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

wish you didn't have to go or wasn't going. So, in that vein I'll be singing bring the boys home, like I'm doing now. And I never thought that it might include one of my distinguished colleagues who I've been blessed to serve with, but I definitely will be praying for you and your family. And I, too, would like to latch on to the things that are being said about if you need of me... I don't know what you could need of me, but they say it is better to have it and not need it, than need it and not have it. So, I'm offering it to you and wish you the best. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want everybody to know that... and there are divergent points of view regarding the war and the conduct of it, but this has nothing to do with I want everyone to know that Jim Watson does not have to go... did not have to go, did not have to re-up. did it because he wanted to. He did it because he wanted I know a little bit about civil affairs. I served in the old 363rd Civil Affairs Brigade. Jim, I ETS'd in 1978, but it is a marvelous job that he's going there to do and albeit a dangerous one. Ask him about what civil affairs soldiers and officers do and he'll tell you the job that they do. I just want to simply say this, did not know Jim that well, but he always had something we that talked about in the service called military bearing. Even though he wasn't on active duty, he was just, you know, around the House here, he always had that. I remember asking him once about a lanyard, I needed a neck lanyard, and he said I'll get you one. And I have a feeling it would probably would

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

say U.S. Marines on it, which would be hard for me to wear. You just have to understand interservice rivalry. But I will tell you this, I will wait 'til the time that you come back and bring your men back home, and if you bring me a United States Marine lanyard, this old Army soldier will be proud to wear it. Godspeed. God bless you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Joyce."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Jim, we share a lot in common. Joyce: We have a lot of similar likes, not the least of which is the love of children. Last Saturday night, my home parish of Saint St. Cajetan's held a special service for military personnel, men and women that have served overseas, have served in Baghdad, or Iraq... Afghanistan, or Iraq, or are serving, or are going to be deployed. It was an amazing service. On a Saturday night on the south side of Chicago, three-thousand (3,000) people gathered to pray for safe return, to offer support and it was a moving experience. All of the military personnel were there. The Colonel was there. The man who flies Marine One came and presented a flag to someone who had been... received three (3) Purple Hearts in the last three (3) years. At the end of the service, the names were listed... were read off of people from our neighborhood serving overseas or going to be deployed. There were seventy-two (72) young men and women from one parish, from St. Cajetan's, which is where I was born and raised; where I live now, where my kids go. the speaker said that this an unbelievable credit to this community, to this neighborhood, and those names were specifically mentioned to pray for. At that time, people

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

in the crowd said any names we forgot would you please stand up. So, at that point there were probably another fifty (50) or sixty (60) names that people stood up and mentioned the name and told them where they were serving or when they were being deployed. So, at that time, I thought it appropriate to stand up and say Staff Sergeant James Watson, heading to California and then to Irag in February. And then afterwards, there was a gathering of people and I was fortunate enough to be around all the families from St. Cajetan's and I felt very confident and secure in saying... telling them about you, my friend Jim Watson, who will be going over there. And I truly believe in the bottom of my heart that those boys and girls from St. Cajetan's have a better chance of coming home safe because you will be there. Like everyone else, I wish you Godspeed and thank you for your service, not only in the Legislature, but to our country and to our state and to all the families that have young children overseas. I think they have a much better chance of coming home safe because you will be there."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Graham."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Watson, I am just ecstatic for you. When I first got here in 2003, then Representative Kelly and I were coming down the hall and you rushed over to us and you introduced yourself. And being new to elected office and working with people across the aisle, you said, 'Well, I'm a Republican and I want to make sure that you guys get the information that you need.'

Robin and I looked at each other and said 'Hmm... he's a nice

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

guy.' And then you... oh, not like that, but anyway, we said hmm, because he offered his services to help us learn. No, but volunteering to get us information. You always sent us helpful historical information. And you kind of said that there's a lot of people down here, be careful and just kind of said, you know, things that you need, showed us in which direction we needed to go in. And like most people, we were delighted to have you as a friend. You led by example by showing that you were there to help us. And even when we would come and have debates, you would come over and give us little tidbits about, well, you know, this was good or work with this and it was just really great. glad to see that you're leading by example by what you believe and if other people can go and serve, so can you. I do wish you as well, Godspeed in your return and I know that being the historian that you are that you'll come back and give us what everybody else isn't telling us about what's going on. And I'm just ecstatic to have served with you and just going forward here. So, I'm looking forward to your return and God bless."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, I think. No, seriously, Mr. Speaker, I am, you know, humbled by your words and by your kindness. Just three (3) things quickly. One question that's always asked is why? You know, why would you do this? And you know, some of it was mentioned in the Resolution, but I came across this bumper sticker that says, 'It can't always be someone else's son.' And I believe that, or daughter. There are one hundred and sixty thousand (160,000)

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Americans serving in Iraq right now. A hundred and sixty thousand (160,000) men and women carrying the same water over and over again. And I think, given the buildup and nature of our Armed Forces, those of us who have a skill base need to help out when we can. And I feel a calling. I feel that I have a set of skills that will be productive in our efforts in Iraq, but it's important to me, that each of you know that you are an important part of the foundation of those skills. I have learned so much from my time here. I have learned as... we have differences like they have in Iraq; have differences of gender, geography, and ideology, and religion so do we, but the important thing I've learned here is to respect your passion that each of you bring when you advocate on behalf of your constituents, to respect your courage when you stand up, when you say this is wrong, regardless of who it will upset, regardless of what those consequences could be. Most importantly, I respect each of you and your commitment to this state and to your districts. I respect this process and I think it's important that we make sure this process is respected. So, when I go to Iraq, you know, we talk, yeah, I'll have an M4 and I'll be armed with a 9 millimeter, but probably more important is I will be armed with your respect, with your passion, with your courage, and those are necessary things to win a counterinsurgency war. I little bit of you guys will be with me. thing, there hasn't been a lot to be proud of Springfield the last year or two (2) and we all know that. I wish that the public could see some of the things that

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

I've seen. This is a perfect paradigm, right now, what has happened this last week of how this institution could work and should work. The day I went in and it kind of went public, Representative Dan Beiser, called and said if you need anything I'll help you, a Democrat reaching across the Leader Cross wasn't real comfortable with my decision, but when I decided to do it, he stood and said, 'I got your back.' Representative Mitchell, Representative Stephens have been there from the beginning, Representative Myers and Tracy, Poe, and Brauer, Representative Bost have all stood up and said, 'If your district needs something, I will be there when you're gone.' Speaker Madigan, the Chairman of the Democrat Party, has said, 'There's a time to put things aside, we will help.' Ladies and Gentlemen, we can do better than we have done in Illinois and this is the perfect example of how it should be done and how it It's a matter of the makeup and the could be done. leadership and the will of the people in this Body. I am honored to serve with you, I'm humbled that the people send me here to serve with you and I appreciate your words and I look forward to... coming back in two hundred and seventy (270) days and... hopefully, we'll have another... another pleasant gathering, but I do have one guestion. probably, well, Leader Cross isn't here, so I would ask the Speaker. Oh, there he is. If I get in a situation where maybe you... I mean, you two are kind of like the generals of this battlefield, so to speak, if I find myself in a situation where I have to question, or challenge a general, do you recommend I use Representative Black's tactics or

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

- Representative Davis's tactics? With that guys, thank you very much."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens moves for the adoption of House Resolution 889. Those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. There was a request from Mr. Stephens that all House Members be added as cosponsors of the Resolution. Is there leave? Leave is granted. All House Members shall be added as cosponsors of the Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could have your attention for the purpose of an announcement. Mr. Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans will caucus immediately upon our adjournment or our time in which we will be suspended from the House Floor. There will be a caucus in Room 118. And Representative Watson, I certainly want to offer my best wishes and my thanks for your duty to your service and your country. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brady, do you have an estimate of time?"

  Brady: "Somewhere in between an hour to maybe an hour and a half."
- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. The Democrats will stand at ease. And in light of what Mr. Brady said, we should be due back here in about 2:00. Right around 2:00 we can plan to come back to the floor. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, will you read the Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee Rules, to which the following measures were referred action taken on January 9, 2008, reported the same

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

back with the following recommendation/s: 'direct floor consideration' for House Bill 1841 which was referred...
'direct floor consideration' for House Amendment 1 to House Bill 1841 and House Amendment #12 to Senate Bill 572.
Representative Yarbrough, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety to which the following measures were referred, action taken on January 9, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' for House Bill 4170."

- Speaker Hannig: "On Supplemental Calendar #1, we have under House Bills-Second Reading, House Bill 4163. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4163, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 4170."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4170, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 4191."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4191, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. And on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading is Senate Bill 437. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 437, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. On page 2 of the Calendar, on the Order of Motions in writing, there appears Senate Bill 307. Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

  Having voted on the prevailing side, I would move that we reconsider the vote by which this Bill failed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig, could you hold your Motion for a moment, please? Thank you. The regular Session shall stand in recess."
- Speaker Madigan: "The regular Session shall come to order. And on the Supplemental Calendar #1, there appears House Bill 1841. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1841, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hamos, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hamos."
- Hamos: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a simple
  Amendment to amend the RTA Act to require that the
  Authority will coordinate public participation processes
  with the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning. It

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

- deletes everything after the enacting clause except for that small language change."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1841 is on the Order of Third Reading.

  The Bill has not been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on the Order of Second Reading, then read the Bill for a second time."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1841, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

  Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No further Amendments has been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading.

  Mr. Clerk, on Supplemental Calendar #1 there appears House
  Bill 2482. What is the status of the Bill? 2482."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2482, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, have you read the Bill for a second time?"

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Clerk Bolin: "Bill's been read for a second time today."

Speaker Madigan: "Leave the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. On page 12 of Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 1685. Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to call House Bill 1685. It creates the agreement among states to elect the President by national popular vote. I move to pass 1685."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. This matter is on the Concurrence Calendar and there is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 by Mr. Ford. And so, the Gentleman's Motion is to Concur with Senate Amendment #1. Those in favor... Mr. Reis. Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, this kind of just caught us by surprise.

Could you tell us exactly what's happened with this Bill from the time it... it started out not being this and the Senate amended it? And the Amendment became the Bill, is that correct? Or..."

Ford: "The Amendment became the Bill of this. Yes."

Reis: "Okay. What does the Amendment do?"

Ford: "The Amendment... What is does... it's... it creates a agreement among the states to elect a President by the national popular vote."

Reis: "So, is this a... would this be like a Resolution, that you're recommending this? You can't do away with the Constitution and the electoral college, so I'm confused as to what exactly this Bill does."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Ford: "This Bill is the exact same Bill that was passed in the House, House Bill 858 and as I said, it... moves to elect the President of the United State by national popular vote."

Reis: "So, how does that affect the electoral college?"

Ford: "We want to elect the President by popular vote."

Reis: "So, you're doing away with the electoral college?"

Ford: "No, that's not what it does. The electoral college will still be in existence, but this Bill says that we should elect the President by a national popular vote."

Reis: "Okay, bear with me, Speaker. I'm kind of reading as I go along with this. There was another Bill that came through this chamber that would change how... the electoral votes for Illinois would be determined. But you're saying that we're not going to do that anymore, this is just going to be a popular vote."

Ford: "That's right."

Reis: "Isn't a part of the U.S. Constitution that the electoral college is part of...? How does this Bill... how would that change that?"

Ford: "Well, I think the U.S. Constitution states that it's okay for us to... ask... for the state to use the national popular vote as... an option."

Reis: "Mr. Speaker, maybe there's some more questions that could get to the bottom of this, but I would recommend that the Sponsor pull this Bill out of the record until we've had more time to look at it. And maybe, as I said, more questions that come up, we'll find out exactly what this Bill does."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the same Bill that Representative Molaro argued for over an hour. That's House Bill 858. So it's the same Bill that passed in this House, previously, by 65 votes."

Reis: "That Bill does not get away with it... do away with the electoral college. It changes how we determine electoral votes for Illinois..."

Ford: "Right, right."

Reis: "So, I think you're confused about what your Bill does."

Ford: "I'm not confused."

Reis: "And that why I wanted you to... to pull it out of record until you understood it."

Ford: "I'm not confused by anything, Representative."

Reis: "You said that you were going to elect the President by popular vote, and that's not what Molaro's Bill did."

Ford: "Representative, you should read it before you say I'm confused about what I'm reading to you. This is just to..."

Reis: "With all due respect, Representative..."

Ford: "This will assure... this will simply say..."

Reis: "You're explaining the Bill. I'm asking the questions, so..."

Ford: "Well, this will just assure, I said, that the nation...
that the popular vote wins the election. That's it."

Reis: "Will be used to determine Illinois's nineteen (19), or twenty-one (21) electoral votes."

Ford: "Twenty-one (21)."

Reis: "That isn't what you said before, so..."

Ford: "Right. That's not what you heard."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Reis: "Well, I stand in opposition to this today, just as the same as I did before. If anything and I think Representative Molaro agreed to this, was that if we want to change it to a popular vote, let's do that by Senate... or congressional district. So whoever wins that congressional district, that congressional vote would go towards that candidate. But for just to say whoever wins the popular vote in the United States would automatically get Illinois's nineteen (19) electoral votes, is just wrong. It's not what our founding fathers set out to do. We got to protect own government from our own tyranny and abuses that goes on and..."

Ford: "Representative, I think..."

Reis: "And this electoral college has worked for years and to change it to a popular vote, I just feel is wrong."

Ford: "Thank you."

Reis: "Thank you for your answering the questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, this is a statutory Bill. Would you not have to change the Illinois Constitution in order to move towards a popular vote, winner takes all?"

Ford: "No."

Black: "In the State of Illinois?"

Ford: "No."

Black: "Our staff attorneys indicate that you must change the Illinois Constitution. Otherwise, it provides for electors of both Parties, and I assume those electors a year from

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

now will meet, as required by the Illinois Constitution, and they will cast their electoral votes, right?"

Ford: "Right."

Black: "I don't think this Bill can change the Constitution."

Ford: "Okay."

Black: "Then why would we pursue it? I'm sorry, what?"

Ford: "I'm sorry. Will you please repeat your question?"

Black: "Well, if I heard you correctly, you said... well, it might be right. This Bill does not change the Illinois Constitution, and if it doesn't do that... it doesn't really change anything, so why should we pursue the statute? You're making a statutory change that in my humble opinion does not change the Illinois Constitution. So, regardless of whether this Bill becomes law, it will not change the way electors are selected in the State of Illinois and those electors will meet about year from now and cast their vote for the winner of the Illinois vote."

Ford: "But it... it wouldn't change the Constitution, Representative Black, at all."

Black: "I know that."

Ford: "Okay."

Black: "And since it doesn't change the Constitution, it doesn't do anything."

Ford: "All right."

Black: "The law is in conflict with the Illinois Constitution on how the electors will be chosen and meet and cast their vote in, I think, they generally do it here in Springfield."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Ford: "Which... which... what are you... what part of the Constitution are you saying would be in violation again, Representative Black?"

Black: "The Illinois Constitution states how electors are chosen in the State of Illinois."

Ford: "Right."

Black: "And when and where they will meet. And that they are bound by the Illinois Constitution to cast their electoral votes for the winner of the presidential contest November of 2008 in the State of Illinois. This Bill will not change that."

Ford: "Okay. Which section of the Constitution are you referring to?"

Black: "Hang on. I'm not a constitutional scholar, but I'm listening to those that are. Just a second. The staff informs me that we have an agreement about the national electoral group and that unless all states follow your lead..."

Ford: "Right."

Black: "...this Bill is meaningless."

Ford: "Right, right."

Black: "And I don't think... and I don't think you're ever get Wyoming, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana to ever agree to this."

Ford: "Okay."

Black: "And there are reasons why they won't. Right? I know that... I realize that your constitutional authority there is Representative Froehlich. I... I see... I see him giving you

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

the answers. Be careful if he moves his hand up your coat, he'll think he's Edgar Bergen."

Ford: "Excuse me. This is my friend. Don't bother him."

Black: "Well, he was doing a wonderful job. I'm one of the few old enough on the floor to remember Edgar Bergen and I'm not about to call you Charlie McCarthy. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think I'm going down a blind alley here. Ladies and Gentlemen, excuse me, I know it's very popular, particularly in recent electoral history, to want declare the winner of the Presidential Election on the basis of the popular vote and I don't philosophical objection to that, but if you'll just look at the United States Constitution and the positive brilliance of the people who wrote that. Okay, you want to elect a President by virtue of the popular vote. Let's say a candidate that you particularly don't like, or is not of your Party or persuasion, wins California, Texas, Florida, Pennsylvania, New York, and Illinois by huge pluralities. Would... would you not, perhaps, be in a situation where eight (8) or nine (9) populous states who vote overwhelmingly for a candidate could elect that candidate by virtue of popular vote even though the vast majority of the states, in fact, did not vote for that candidate, but a Wyoming or a North Dakota or a Kansas don't have the population to match the voter turnout of California, Texas, Florida, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, Michigan. You're... you're... if you're not careful with a Bill like this, you're going to let a President be elected by a popular vote that occurs in a minority of the states. You

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

know, the drafters of the United States Constitution... I imbued with such inherent don't know how they were intelligence. And I think we should be very, very careful before we try to change something that has not been thoroughly discussed, has not been thoroughly debated; sure a popular vote idea sounds pretty good, it's how we run. But remember the diversity of this great country of ours, and where the population is moving. It's leaving... you know, it's being concentrated now in ten (10) or eleven (11) states and I don't see that changing anytime soon. don't want to sacrifice my vote in Illinois to what may be a three million (3,000,000) vote landslide for a candidate who does very well in California, Florida and Texas and other states. I don't think this Bill really accomplishes anything. If it makes you feel good to say we're for a popular vote, okay. But this isn't going to change anything. And I think if we really want to change the electoral college set-up perhaps we should amend the United States Constitution and that could certainly be done by our federal officeholders, but it has worked fairly well. And I think the reason it has worked fairly well, certainly with some bumps in the road in recent electoral history, is that it tried to guarantee all states in this country a reasonable ability to elect and vote for a candidate of their choice. If this Bill becomes law, and it would have to become law in a vast majority of states, you are giving tremendous power to those huge states. I don't think that was the intent of the 'Miracle at Philadelphia' more than two hundred (200) years ago. I don't think it's time to do

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

it now, in this format. It's late in the Session, or early in the Session, I'm not even sure what Session we're in. I think this is something that we should have public hearings on, discuss it and debate it openly for a serious... for a long period of time. Let's not do it today; let's not do it under these circumstances. Let's admit that the Jefferson's, the Adams's, the Franklin's, those people who met in Philadelphia must have had remarkable, good common sense. And what they did, I think, has stood the test of time. And I stand in opposition of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Winters: "Representative Ford, I have one concern with the idea of the... proposal you have before us, that a majority of the... voting electorate of the entire United States would then determine how electoral votes are cast by the states that agree to this compact. My concern is that if we have a close election, say, one that is determined... the major ... excuse me, it wouldn't be a plurality because there will always be votes cast for someone other than two (2) leading Party candidates. So, we almost automatically will see a plurality and say, by some miracle, it is such a closely run, beautifully debated, evenly matched contest between two (2) stellar and outstanding candidates that the voting public almost evenly divides. And you have maybe a hundred vote majority or plurality or a thousand vote plurality. Now, you're not going to be able to tell where that plurality of a thousand (1,000) votes came from Illinois,

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

or Florida, or New York, or California or Wyoming. You're going to... under the provisions of this proposal, you would then have to have every precinct in the United States would have to be certified, looked at again, making sure there weren't any hanging chads or anything else that would determine the loss of one (1) or two (2) votes. You would call for a national verification of every vote, if we happen to have a close... a close vote. Currently, under the ...the case of the electoral college, if there is a close challenge, it's going to be in one (1) state and we would see a recount, a checking of those votes, in one (1) state, such as Florida in 2000. Where at least, we're not looking at the other forty-nine (49) states. I think this is inherently a dangerous proposal in that we could have the Federal Government of this United States tied up for months, even years, we could see no President other than ones selected by Congress, because the recount... almost the revote would take so long in all fifty (50) states, each state under its own electoral rules, that you would, in fact... you would, in fact, tie up the Federal Government for Is there any response you have in the relatively minor chance, but nevertheless a realistic chance, a very, very close Federal Election? How would you handle the recount that would be needed, if there was that close of a vote?"

Ford: "I mean, I believe that we've… we've had that problem with the way elections are held now. And so, I think, if…"
Winters: "But we don't recount the entire country."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Ford: "If... if it happens... if it happens, then I think it's more of a less a wait. It's just that we'll have to wait until it's determined. We had the same problem, what how many years ago, when... in 2000."

Winters: "Right."

Ford: "And so..."

Winters: "But we only recounted one (1) state and we were able to concentrate the legal resources, fight it out, in one (1) state. We would have to do that for all fifty (50) states across the country if, in fact, this compact takes place."

Ford: "Are you saying that we would have to look at all fifty (50) because..."

Winters: "Say there's a thousand votes (1,000)."

Ford: "...each state would be close?"

Winters: "Say there's a thousand (1,000) vote difference between the two (2) leading candidates. I'm not going to, as member of one Party, say that Wyoming maybe only has two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000) voters, but I might pick up one hundred (100) votes there if I verify and recount every …every vote in that state. I'm not going to let any state go unexamined if this Bill takes place and you have a close election. I think that's where the electoral college virtually guarantees a majority and a large majority of the electoral college even in a relatively close election."

Ford: "Thank you."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Winters: "Mr. Speaker. In the case that this Bill should get a Constitutional Majority, I would ask to verify the Roll Call."

Ford: "Would be good."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, right now, we're actually on the Amendment. What I would suggest, if it would be okay with the Member..."

Winters: "That's fine."

Speaker Hannig: "...why don't we adopt the Amendment, we'll continue to debate and then I'll recognize you... Okay. Excuse me, we're on the Order of Concurrence. The Chair is corrected. So..."

Winters: "Right. So this is... this is the vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Yes, so you're correct, and I was in error.

So, your... your Motion..."

Winters: "Can you repeat what you just said?"

Speaker Hannig: "...by you request... Pardon?"

Winters: "Could you repeat what you just said?

Speaker Hannig: "This is Representative Hannig is in the Chair, and I was in error."

Winters: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "This is a Motion to Concur and so it is a final vote. And so your... your request for a verification will be recognized."

Winters: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "And Representative Fritchey, you're recognized next."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Fritchey: "Representative, what the... what the Bill...

Representative Ford."

Ford: "Yes."

Fritchey: "Are you with me?"

Ford: "I'm with you."

Fritchey: "Okay. What... what this Bill does would stipulate that should the requisite number of states all pass the identical Bill, there would essentially be a binding compact or an agreement that would pledge all of the electoral votes to that candidate that got the majority of the of the popular vote. Correct?"

Ford: "Correct."

Fritchey: "And because these states all willingly passed that legislation and are part of this, they would not object to that. Correct?"

Ford: "Correct."

Fritchey: "A matter of fact, should they pass the legislation, it would be a reflection that they approve of this concept and manner of electing a United States President, correct?"

Ford: "Right."

Fritchey: "And that concept is that one of the bedrock principles of democracy is the concept that majority rules.

Correct?"

Ford: "Right."

Fritchey: "And there is nothing shocking or perverted in the system to say that the majority of individuals supporting one candidate should expect that that candidate would be the winning candidate, correct?"

Ford: "Right."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Fritchey: "And even if the overwhelming number of people in the country happen to live in five (5) or six (six) states, which isn't the case, but if it did, if geography dictated that the majority of the population lived in a minority of the states, the fact of the matter is that the United States President is elected to represent all Americans. Correct?"

Ford: "Right."

Fritchey: "Regardless of where they live. So whether the… all the Americans in this country were equally divided in fifty states (50), or if the majority of them were only in ten (10) states, the majority of those Americans are entitled to have their votes proportionately heard so that the majority prevails. Correct?"

Ford: "Right."

Fritchey: "And that's one of the things that makes this country so great, isn't it?"

Ford: "That's right."

Fritchey: "And this... this law simply tries to say, we have a national movement now to have the requisite number of states voluntarily enact identical legislation to reaffirm the concept that majority rule and majority election of the United States President is really wholeheartedly consistent and in keeping with what the idea of the founding fathers were, and what the fundamental nature of democracy is. Is that correct?"

Ford: "That's right."

Fritchey: "And this Bill does nothing more or nothing less than that. Isn't that correct?"

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Ford: "That's it."

Fritchey: "So, there's really no reason to... for anybody to oppose this Bill, is there?"

Ford: "I agree. Thank you."

Fritchey: "I have no further questions. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Fortner: "The previous speaker raised the comment about the bedrock concept of majority rule. We hear that phrase a lot, but what I'd like to ask the Sponsor is, in this chamber does the passage of a Bill require a simple Majority vote? Could we pass a Bill in this chamber with just a simple Majority vote?"

Ford: "Yes."

Fortner: "I... I would beg to differ. We need a Constitutional Majority. We need at least the number which is greater than 50 percent; that's not a simple Majority. Simple Majority could be any number as long as it's the largest of all the different sides. Am I correct?"

Ford: "Okay."

Fortner: "Would you agree with me on that?"

Ford: "What do we need sixty (60)?"

Fortner: "Would you agree with me on that?"

Ford: "What do we need sixty (60)?"

Fortner: "Well, I'm just saying, in this chamber to pass a Bill you need a Majority. Now, let me ask the following question. On the idea of Majority when it comes to leading nations, because we're talking about what it takes to lead

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

nations, and the bedrock principle, what it means to lead one of the great nations of this world, let's look to how the other democracies... how do they understand that? If you look at the other great democracies, I would ask, is there any other country where their leader can be elected by a mere simple Majority, just a simple Majority? So that if you had a three or four candidate race, you could have a winner with only say, 25 or 30 percent. Is there ...are there... is that a common practice among the democracies of the world?"

Ford: "Well, I don't know, Google it."

Fortner: "Well, I would argue that it's not. If you look at Canada, Britain, Germany, the ones that use parliaments, they need again, like we do with our Bills, a Majority means at least 50 percent. This proposal, I understand what's being tried to be reached with this, and I think as Representative Black mentioned, there's a way to do this by dealing with the Constitution. However... however, in other parliamentary democracies they require that a Majority means a parliamentary majority, much like we do with our Bills. Let me consider those countries that elect their President directly, not by parliament. Let's look at France. What they have is they have a runoff, that is, if you had the case where nobody reached a 50 percent Majority level, 50 percent plus one (1), they have a runoff to make sure that a fringe Minority candidate does not sneak through. Does this Bill have any runoff protection to keep a fringe Minority candidate in the multipart... member race from sneaking through? Is there any protection?"

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Ford: "Any protection for a runoff?"

Fortner: "To provide a runoff, let's say you had four (4) or five (5) candidates and the winning candidate only had 27 percent of the vote. Is there any protection that would provide for a runoff to make sure that was not a fringe candidate that was certainly not representative of the will of the American people."

Ford: "The will of the American people would be... and what studies show is that a majority wins."

Fortner: "No, as I'm pointing out, elsewhere..."

Ford: "We're not... please don't..."

Fortner: "Both in this... both in this country, in various states and in other democracies around the world, the principle is that you need to protect the country from a fringe candidate who would get through with a small number, say, 25, 30 percent in a multimember race and the other countries have protection from that. This Bill offers no such protection against a fringe candidate getting through in a large... we're used to two-party races, and in two-party races I can see how your proposal would basically work. However, this would apply to any race, a race where you might have four (4) or five (5) candidates, all vying for significant fraction, and the fringe candidate could sneak through at that point. Other countries other states often have protections. We have protections with the way we do Bills. Let me also make one other point. Are you aware then in the early 1970s there was an attempt to do this by... roughly by Constitutional Amendment, to actually reform this and provide a mechanism? There was an attempt. Are

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

you aware that that Constitutional Amendment when proposed had a runoff protection procedure? They had a... they had a procedure in there to provide that if no one reached a certain threshold in percentage, there would be a runoff. There would be some kind of protective measure, so that you would not just have a simple winner with what could be very small fraction of the vote. Were you aware of that?"

Ford: "Representative, we will not be abolishing the electoral college with this."

Fortner: "I didn't say you were. I said could someone win the national election for the presidency with as little as 25 percent of the vote, if I had five (5) or six (6) candidates running?"

Ford: "Is it possible for that to happen?"

Fortner: "Yes."

Ford: "I mean, now?"

Fortner: "It is not possible now unless the..."

Ford: "Okay."

Fortner: "...because..."

Ford: "Unless... right."

Fortner: "...they would need a majority of something. They need majo... right now today, they need a majority of electors. So they do need a 50 percent plus 1 majority of something, and in this case it's electors. What you're saying is..."

Ford: "Of... of... the popular vote, or of the electors?"

Fortner: "Of the electors."

Ford: "Right."

Fortner: "There is something much like our Founding Fathers based it much like... when they looked at the other

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

democracies that existed at the time they recognized you need some kind of protection. Does the electoral college sometimes get it wrong? Sure, we've seen sometimes when it get it wrong. There are right ways and wrong ways to fix it, and I would point out that even if you want to do this, there should have at least been the same protection that was contemplated by people, including some of those very same people who've put forward this popular vote compact. Some of the very same people who are in favor of that some thirty-odd years ago, they did not, for whatever reason, put the same protection in that they recognized was the right way to do it. For that reason, I would strongly urge a 'no' vote. And if these people are serious about putting in this kind of thing, either do it correctly with a full S. Amendment to the Constitution, or by at least providing the basic protections to keep fringe candidates from potentially winning with a very small percentage of the vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman for Bond, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, I... I think you'll agree that this has gone from the ridiculous to the sublime or the other way, I don't know which, but this is absolutely incredible what we're witnessing here. Representative Fortner just stood up and with total understanding tried to explain legislation to another of our Members and I don't how many were listening, but it's clear to me that Representative Fortner understands the electoral process to a degree that most of us can barely comprehend. The fact of the matter

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

is that I was just thinking, man, this could be the worst piece of legislation that I have seen this Session, or then I thought, well maybe it's just this year. And then I thought, well maybe it's the worst piece I've seen today. But then I looked back, Rep... Mr. Speaker and you made me think of this, you said that you had made a mistake. don't know that I've ever heard the Chair admit to a mistake, but then I know what you're referring to. Democratic Party of the State of Illinois has abandoned its people. You have abandoned your people. I'm looking at a Roll Call from the last vote, only 2, Representative Franks and Representative Phelps, standing up for your districts, standing up for Illinois, not putting another four hundred million dollar (\$400,000,000) hole in the budget. thought that we were debating the worst piece legislation of the day, but no we've already passed the worst piece of legislation of the day with a one point seven dol... mil... billion dollar (\$1,700,000,000) shortfall in our budget. The Democratic Leaders of Illinois have said let's make it worse. Shame on you. This is an election year; you will pay and pay again."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. I'd just like to remind everyone, this Bill sits in the Senate. House Bill 858 was voted on months ago; it's the same exact language, check your computer. If you voted against it, you're probably going to vote against it. But... Mr. Speaker. I would like to call the previous question."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. No one else is actually seeking recognition. So, why don't we just go to... Representative Molaro, do you wish to speak?"

Molaro: "Well, I was going to..."

Speaker Hannig: "Why don't we let Representative Ford..."

Molaro: "He was going to let me close."

Speaker Hannig: "Oh, you're going to close?"

Molaro: "Yeah."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay, so Representative Molaro..."

Molaro: "Because he did move to previous question and...

Speaker Hannig: "That's fine."

Molaro: "I think it's only fair."

Speaker Hannig: "You're recognized to close."

Molaro: "All right, thank you. You know, Representative Eddy just did us a favor. This is 858; it passed 65 to 50. It should pass with the same Roll Call. I would hope that after the last couple months if you look over this Bill, that we would even get more votes than it got last time. So, just let me make this absolutely clear. All this does in the United States today, we have in the United States Constitution, not ours, it just says about electoral college and every state could decide how to do it. There's Nebraska and Maine, they do it different ways. Representative over there talked about the fact that maybe we should do it by Congressional district, we could do it anyway we want. That's what the Constitution says. And all we're saying here is, right now in Illinois, we're not a player in the Presidential Election. When it comes to the campaign after the Primary, nobody's going to come here

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

because we're the blue or red. This makes sure that every state and every voter counts, that's what America stands for, every state and every voter counts. And this is exactly what this does, this put Illinois back on the presidential map and the 65 people who voted for it, you did the right thing and the 50 who didn't, rethink it, join us and vote for this tremendous Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Molaro has closed.

  Representative Black, for what reason do you rise? We're finished with the debate, but do you have a parliamentary inquiry?"
- Black: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought we'd called the previous question. I just want to remind all of my friends on the other side of the aisle, those eloquent remarks of Representative Molaro is not what the Democrats said when they got caught by surprise on a simple Majority vote. Most of you have already forgotten the Lyndon LaRouche Party. Set yourselves up for it again, be my guest."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, we've already had... Representative Molaro, do you wish to respond? And we'll close. All right. So the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1685?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And the voting is open. Now, there's been a request for a verification by Representative Winters. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Will Davis and Representative Coulson, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record.

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Okay. There has been a request for a verification by Representative Winters. So, I would ask that the staff retire to rear of the chamber and that the Members please be in their seats. Mr. Clerk, would you read the list of those voting in the affirmative? Excuse me, Repres... there's been a request by Representative Hamos for verification. No, okay. All right. So, Representative Hamos, he... Representative Hamos, he wouldn't... she... he's not giving you leave. So, Mr. Clerk, read the list of those voting in the affirmative."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Acevedo, Arroyo, Bassi, Beiser, Berrios, Boland, John Bradley, Rich Bradley, Brosnahan, Burke, Chapa LaVia, Collins, Colvin, Crespo, Currie, D'Amico, Monique Davis, Will Davis, Dugan, Dunkin, Feigenholtz, Flider, Flowers, Ford, Franks, Fritchey, Froehlich, Golar, Gordon, Graham, and Granberg, Hamos, Hannig, Harris, Hoffman, Holbrook, Howard, Jakobsson, Jefferies, Jefferson, Joyce, Lang, Lyons, Mautino, May, McCarthy, Mendoza, Miller, Molaro, Nekritz, Osterman, Patterson, Phelps, Reitz, Riley, Rita, Ryg, Scully, Smith, Soto, Turner, Verschoore, Washington, Yarbrough, Younge, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters, do you have any questions of those voting the affirmative?"

Winters: "Representative Bassi."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bassi. Okay. Representative Bassi. Is the Lady in the chamber? Okay. Mr. Clerk, remove her. And Representative Miller is asking for

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

verification, for leave for verification. Would you grant that?"

Winters: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Thank you."

Winters: "Representative Dugan."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dugan. She's in her seat."

Winters: "Okay. Representative Joyce."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Joyce is near his seat."

Winters: "Just came in the door. Representative Mendoza."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mendoza. Is the Lady in the chamber? Okay. Remove her, Mr. Clerk."

Winters: "All we have."

Speaker Hannig: "On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes' and 50 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, will you read the Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 766, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 805, offered by Representative Sullivan. House Resolution 807, offered by Representative Kosel. House Resolution 808, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 809, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 810, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 811, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 812, offered by Representative Dunkin. House Resolution 814, offered by Representative Golar. House Resolution 815, offered by Representative Lyons. House Resolution 816, offered by Representative McCarthy. House Resolution 817,

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

offered by Representative McGuire. House Resolution 819, offered by Representative Reis. House Resolution 820, offered by Representative John Bradley. House Resolution 821, offered by Representative Bost. House Resolution 822, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 823, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 824, offered by Representative Winters. House Resolution 825, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 826, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 827, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 829, offered by Representative Dugan. House Resolution 830, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell. House Resolution 831, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 832, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 833, offered by Representative Joyce. House Resolution 834, offered by Representative Ryg. House Resolution 835, offered by Representative Jefferson. House Resolution 836, offered by Representative Will Davis. House Resolution 837, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 838, offered by Representative Stephens. House Resolution 839, offered by Representative Stephens. House Resolution 841, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 842, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 843, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution 844, offered by Representative Sacia. House Resolution House Resolution 845, offered by Representative Acevedo. 846, offered by Representative Pritchard. House Resolution 847, offered by Representative Hernandez. House Resolution 848, offered by Representative Pritchard. House Resolution

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

849, offered by Representative Ryg. House Resolution 851, offered by Representative Froehlich. House Resolution 852, offered by Representative Lyons. House Resolution 854, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 855, offered by Representative Granberg. House Resolution 856, offered by Representative Gordon. House Resolution 857, offered by Representative Flider. House Resolution 858, offered by Representative Speaker Madigan. House Resolution 860, offered by Representative Froehlich. House Resolution 861, offered by Representative Gordon. House Resolution 863, offered by Representative Jefferson. House Resolution 864, offered by Representative McGuire. House Resolution 866, offered by Representative John Bradley. House Resolution 867, offered by Representative John House Resolution 868, offered by Representative Bradley. offered John Bradley. House Resolution 870, Representative Brady. House Resolution 871, offered by Representative Brauer. House Resolution 872, offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 873, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 876, offered by Representative Krause. House Resolution 877, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 878, offered by House Resolution 879, offered by Representative Bellock. Representative Sullivan. House Resolution 881, offered by Representative Lou Lang. House Resolution 882, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 884, offered by Representative Washington. House Resolution 887, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 888, offered by

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Representative Kosel and House Joint Resolution 80, offered by Representative Bellock."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "State your inquiry."

Eddy: "Can you... it appears as if we're preparing to adjourn. We're not. Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "Actually we're just trying to take care of a little business."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you very much. I was just... my inquiry has to do the budget implementation Bill for education. I've had several calls. Is that something that is on the agenda or soon to be? The status of..."

Speaker Hannig: "I'm advised by the Speaker that we need to consult with the Governor."

Eddy: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Hannig: "We need to consult with the Governor."

Eddy: "Well, I would... I would... I think... I can think of a couple dozen things I'd like to say, but I don't think I'll... I'll say any of them. I was just hopeful, of course, that... that... is something and I know the Speaker's indicated it could possibly be on the agenda and I've had a lot of calls on it. I'm hopeful that it's something we act on soon and I just wanted to inquire. Thank you."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative May, for what reason do you rise?"
- May: "Yes. While we're at ease, I'm advised that we have enough time for the Environmental Caucus to meet in 115.

  And a staffer will accompany us and tell us when we are continuing action on the floor. So, Environmental Caucus for those who are at ease; we will start our meeting in 115. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- "Mr. Speaker, the Rules are very clear, you cannot have concurrent meetings when the House in Session, but I'll be willing to waive the Rule. But now we have to turn on the lights in a different room, turn up the heat, a staffer has to go down there. Look at the carbon imprint. We should all stay here in one room so we use less electricity and we have less of a carbon imprint and if we could all... and I promise I will sit down and breath more slowly, so as not to exhale as much carbon dioxide. And after a brief period of time if we could... if we could have Mr. Ellis lead us in a rousing chorus of Kumbaya, perhaps we could even adjourn. You know I... as strange as that may be. But I... these concurrent meetings... I... I'm worried about the carbon imprint by opening up new rooms, having staff have to waste time and energy. We should stick together here in one room and by the way, we can turn down the lights and if you can get the building engineer, tell him he can turn up the air conditioning. It's... it's colder than you know what in

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

- here. I just talked to a well digger and he won't even come up here, it's so cold."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you read the Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action on January 9, 2008, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'direct floor consideration' for Floor Amendment #14 to Senate Bill 572."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. On page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Consideration Postponed, is Senate Bill 572. Mr. Clerk, return that to the Order of second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. So, Mr. Clerk, are there any Motions filed?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 572, the Bill's been read a Second time, previously. Amendments 5 and 6 have been adopted to the Bill. A Motion has been filed to table Amendments 5 and 6. The Motion has been filed by Representative Hamos."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos on the Motion to Table."
- Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to table Amendments 5 and 6. They are being replaced by Amendment 14."
- Speaker Hannig: "Any discussion? Then all in favor of the Lady's Motion say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendments are tabled. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendments 10, 12, 13, and 14 have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos on Amendment #10."
- Hamos: "Speaker, I move to withdraw Amendment #10."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #10. And Mr. Clerk, what is the next Amendment?"

Clerk: "Floor Amendment #12, offered by Representative Hamos."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos on Amendment #12."

Hamos: "I move to withdraw Amendment #12."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #12. Mr. Clerk, what is the next Amendment?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #13, offered by Representative Hamos."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "I move to withdraw Amendment #13."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #13. Mr. Clerk, are there further Amendment?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #14, offered by Representative Hamos."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "I move to withdraw Amendment #14. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm calling Amendment #14. Hello."

Speaker Hannig: "So..."

Hamos: "I withdraw my Motion."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #14. And all in favor say, 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendment?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Now, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 572, the Bill's been read a third time, previously."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Speaker Hannig: "Before we start, Representative Cross, did you have an inquiry or did you wish to speak on..."

Cross: "I had a question on Amendment 14."

Speaker Hannig: "Well, why don't we let her open and then we'll recognize you for a question."

Cross: "I just have a question about it before you go to it."

Speaker Hannig: "Parliamentary question?"

Cross: "No, I have a question about an Amendment that was withdrawn."

Speaker Hannig: "No, it was adopted."

Cross: "Now... I know 14 was adopted, but another one she took off the table, so to speak, 12. I want to know why. I just have a question and I'm sure she can answer it."

Speaker Hannig: "...Fair enough. Representative Hamos."

Cross: "Representative Hamos, in one of your earlier Amendments you had a provision in there that allowed for DuPage County to col... take their one quarter percent increase in the sales tax to use it for both transportation and/or public safety. My understanding now with Amendment 14 that is no longer a option for DuPage County."

Hamos: "That is correct."

Cross: "Why?"

Hamos: "You know, there were... there was a last minute Amendment filed this morning. It included several provisions in there around which there really was no consensus and I'm working to pass a Bill. And I'm working for con... as much consensus as possible. And when I realized that some of the DuPage County Legislators were against it, I thought it had not been vetted properly, we had not gone through a

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

committee and I thought it was more appropriate at this time to withdraw that... to change that."

Cross: "So, the discretion that DuPage County would have had under the Amendment 12, giving them more discretion as to how they want to spend the money, has been taken off the table."

Hamos: "You know, again, I was... I was open to that, but I learned that the DuPage County Legislators had some concerns about that. And again, it was treating DuPage a little bit differently, in fact very differently, than the other collar counties."

Cross: "Right."

Hamos: "And we didn't think that was maybe appropriate, there was some questions raised about that. We had had that quarter percent sales tax increase for the five (5) collar counties for transportation purposes out there for the past six (6) months and there seemed to be a lot of consensus around that. This last change just came up at the last minute, and there wasn't enough consensus to make that work."

Cross: "I assume you polled every DuPage Legislator."

Hamos: "Well, I didn't, but I'm working toward a 'yes'."

Cross: "Okay. Bottom line is at the end of the day, you've now taken away whatever discretion DuPage County would have had if, in fact, this Bill passes. I just wanted to confirm that under Amendment #14. Thank you the for chance to inquire and I know we'll debate them further... debate it more on Third Reading. Thank you."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Speaker Hannig: "Why don't... why don't we begin. We'll let
Representative Hamos have 5 minutes to begin the debate,
and then we'll go to questions and answers and we'll run
the 5 minute clock. So Representative Hamos, you're
recognized for 5 minutes."

"Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. The first time that I called this Bill on September 4, I gave you twenty (20) reasons why this Amendment should be... why this Bill should be adopted. Today, I'm not going to do that. I'm going to give you one (1) reason. And that one (1) reason is that January 20, a very significant, serious doomsday approaching. The regional transportation, the RTA system this year is experiencing a four hundred million dollar (\$400,000,000) deficit that is going to require very significant service cuts, fare increases and the layoff of twenty-four hundred (2,400) employees. We're talking... if the CTA alone to eliminate eighty-one (81) of its one hundred fifty-four (154) bus routes, nearly 53 percent of all CTA bus service. Pace would eliminate seventy (70) weekend fixed routes, twenty-six (26) weekday, et cetera et cetera. I can go through the whole list. Look, there are two million (2,000,000) rides a day in the RTA region on the Regional Transit System. This is a serious investment in the future of this region, it is an economic development engine. It is what makes the region work and we have the responsibility as Legislators to make sure that we have done everything possible to avert this terrible, terrible January 20 doomsday deadline. This piece of legislation is good public policy. I'm proud of it. We worked it out in

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

a bipartisan, open, collaborative process. We knew three (3) years ago that this day was coming. We learned about the transit system, we had a very strong and active Mass Transit Committee, and I thank them for their involvement. We did our due diligence. We commissioned the first ever independent audit of the transit system. We knew from that audit that we had to do a primarily two (2) things: we had to infuse the system with more dollars, a change that had not been made in the last twenty-four (24) years with more revenues and we also knew that we needed to reform the system. We demanded, essentially, the first ever public employee pension reforms in their pension and retiree This is a serious and sound public health care systems. It is fiscally responsible and it is regionally balanced and we worked very hard to accomplish that. contrast to some of the other debates we had earlier today and other times, I think everyone who supports this Bill should be proud to do so. It has earned the support of all of the editorial boards in the entire region. It is supported by the regional leaders. It certainly will stave off two thousand four hundred (2,400) layoffs from hardworking men and women who run this system, just in the CTA system. So, I would implore you to put aside our differences, to think about how we can come together to be proud of a public policy that we know we need for the Why should downstaters Chicago region. support this? There's obviously funds in there for downstate transit. We're also proud that we are able to boost the operating assistance of downstate transit. The people who use

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

downstate transit depend on it. They may not be two million (2,000,000) rides a day, but they are the seniors, the disabled, the working poor who depend on... on... on downstate transit. So, we have taken care of that, but more importantly we are asking the downstate Legislators today to realize that regional transit is important to the economic development of the entire state, that our business community depends on it, that this is the way we bring people to work, this is the way that we keep people economically independent. This is an important Bill; it's a good Bill. I thank the people who worked on it, so many have for so long. And I urge you to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the passage Senate Bill 572. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. Representative Black, you're up."

Black: "Thank you, very much Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, I notice you've made one public policy change and I want to thank you for that. In the earlier Amendment it gave the Chicago Transit Authority Board the ability to levy the real estate transfer tax. I thought that was horrible public policy. I've noticed that you have taken that out and we're back now to where the Chicago City Council, if they choose to do so, must levy the real estate transfer tax. Is that correct?"

Hamos: "That is correct."

Black: "I think that is a... you're to be commended for that. I think that's a public policy decision that certainly makes

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

it more palatable and... and it lets people hold those who impose a tax accountable, the CTA Board isn't elected. Let me ask you just one other question that I have a concern about. Does the state tax dollars matching funds... do we have to match only what the city real estate transfer tax will generate or that plus the sales tax?"

Hamos: "We are matching we will continue the match as we have had for twenty-four (24) years on the sales tax and we are also matching the real estate transfer tax."

Black: "All right. So, we're matching the sales tax, now at a higher rate, right? Which will cost the general tax dollars more money, right?"

Hamos: "There... there is an impact on the State General Revenue Funds...

Black: "Okay."

Hamos: "...but in contrast to the other Bill that we called earlier today, this is one (1) dollar for every four (4).

So the state continues to contribute at about that's..."

Black: "Okay."

Hamos: "...actually, it's 30 percent out of the total. And the
 state contributes toward the total picture, but it's not
 the full freight."

Black: "If the real estate transfer tax is... is imposed I have to assume, hopefully, the Chicago real estate market will ...will bounce back. The only thing that concerns me about this Bill, Representative, is the amount of money from General State Tax Funds that will be sent to Chicago to do the match is not capped. It could be a hundred million (100,000,000) next year, it could be a hundred and fifty

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

(150,000,000), a hundred and seventy-five (175,000,000), there's no cap. Was it impossible to reach an agreement on what... what a cap on general state tax dollars could be?"

Hamos: "Well, I think... Representative Black, since the last time that we voted on this on September 4, when you raised it, I've also talked to some of your Members about this and I was very aware of this concern and tried to work it out. Here is the issue. In good years it could go up some, obviously it will, but in bad years it might go down, this year, next year, maybe even the following year. We did not want to extend the exposure of the state to create a floor, that would have been the fair thing to do, to have floor and a cap. We didn't do that because we didn't know how we would establish that floor exactly without opening that door. So this way, there's a little bit of shared risk. Yes, it could go up, but if it goes down the CTA is basically going to have to eat it."

Black: "All right. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The only trouble with a 5 minute clock is when we get a 2 minute answer. But to the Bill. I do commend the Sponsor particularly for the removal of what I thought was a very egregious abuse of public policy and that was letting an appointed CTA Board levy a real estate transfer tax in the City of Chicago. I thought that was a horrible piece of public policy; that's been corrected. If the Chicago City Council wants to levy this tax, fine. They'll have to do so by a recorded vote. The only problem I have with this Bill is the amount of money coming from general tax revenues that would have to match the sales tax and the real estate transfer tax

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

amount. And I... I understand the urgency of helping the Regional Transportation Authority in northeastern Illinois, but with the Comptroller's report... and I'll listen to the debate... I'm not comfortable obligating the state for a hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000). To match that will, I'm sure, go up when we don't have the money to do the things that we're supposed to do. And I... I think last not least, Mr. Speaker, let me say, I'm very disappointed that this Bill is moving without opportunity to address a jobs Bill. My district needs those jobs, we need highway improvements, we need bridge improvements, we need water system and sewer improvements and there's no capital jobs Bill and we have said along that we should link the two (2), and it now appears that they will not be linked. My fear is we may not ever, in this Session, come back to a desperately needed capital jobs Bill. And I think that's... I that's a mistake."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters. The Lady from Cook, Representative Bassi."

Bassi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Lady yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Bassi: "I rise in strong support of this Bill. Representative Hamos and I were the Mass Transit Committee for a number of years before there was a mass transit crisis. We saw this coming, we knew it was on its way and we have... when... along with the new Mass Transit Committee have been working very hard to try in a bipartisan fashion to come up with a solution for what is a true crisis. We are using the same

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

funding source that has been used for the last twenty-four (24) years unchanged. It needs to be changed in order to address current needs. This Bill has been... the Bill itself has been over three (3) years in the making and as opposed to Senate Bill 307 which was passed earlier, it does not, repeat does not, put a four hundred (\$400,000,000) dollar hole in the budget. This provides a funding source that will allow them to move forward. reforms we asked for are in the Bill. There is no question but that we need to be looking for capital, a capital jobs program on the way through. But in the meantime, we have money for paratransit. We have money to be sure we can keep the RTA system moving. We will not add two (2) million more cars to the road, to the gridlock that is already existing in northern Illinois. There is funding for downstate and I urge the passage of this Bill. you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I, too, want to commend Representative Hamos for all the hard work she's done. I've seen her work... try to work through this problem, not only this year, but last year the year before that. She's actually been working on it for, I believe, about four and a half years. But when I came here this morning, and I came to Springfield, I was hoping that I was going to get the opportunity to vote on a transportation Bill, one (1) that was for mass transit, and one (1) that was for roads for the metropolitan region of Chicago.

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Because this mass transit crisis is a financial crisis and financial crisis that consists both operational shortfall and it consists of capital needs by the CTA, Metra and Pace. In fact, the capital needs of the CTA are greater than the operational needs. testified two (2) weeks ago in committee that if they did not get four hundred and sixty-five million dollars (\$465,000,000) in capital that we would again return to doomsday by the end of the summer because they would have to put new wheels on the trains, new brakes on the trains, and fix sections of the L and without that money they would seriously impair and have to shutdown sys ... parts of the That... by virtue of that fact, it ties capital to It is necessary to tie capital to transit. transit. You're asking us to vote on one (1) part of the problem without seeing the solution of the other part of the problem. You see, in my county, I have to say to you, our mass transit system we... is one (1) of roads. We move our masses on roads. We haven't had road money in seven (7) years of any significance; we haven't had a capital Bill in seven (7) years. It's a very difficult sell in McHenry County, in any collar county, to go back and say, I can raise taxes on you in McHenry County and half of that money is going to go directly to the CTA, but I can't fix your intersection at Route 31 and 62. It's ridiculous; it's a transportation system that consists of roads. It's a transportation system that needs expansion into the outlying areas for Metra and for Pace. Imagine being a resident in the Village of Huntley or of the City of

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Marengo or the City of Hebron where you have no services offered. You don't have Pace, you don't have Metra, you don't have CTA. You have no way to get your citizens from the doctor to the home, to the home, to the store. is no transit, but 100 percent of those people are going to pay this tax. And the only way I believe that we should be considering a tax increase on the people of the Metropolitan Region is to be able to... be able to apply a tax that is fair and equitable and this is neither fair and it's neither equitable. And it's not equitable because anywhere you go in the region outside the City of Chicago, whether it is suburban Cook or whether it's the collar counties, only about 2 percent of the population is going to use mass transit, and 100 percent of the population is going to pay this tax. But inside the City of Chicago, 30 percent of the population uses mass transit every single day. And I'm sympathetic to the needs of the City of Chicago, but the City of Chicago Representatives have to be sympathetic to the needs of the transportation system of the suburbs, and the rest of the state's. When I look at ... at this Bill and I look at the genesis that this Bill's gone through, just with the governance sharing issue. Okay. We're going to add an appointment for the Cook Board County chairman, Todd Stroger, to make an appointment to Metra. All right? But when I look at the funding formula and I see collar county and suburban Cook money going into the City of Chicago, I don't see any City of Chicago money coming into Metra, but yet fifty-seven (57) Metra stops exist inside the City of Chicago and 20 percent of the

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Metra riders live inside the City of Chicago and to add insult to industry... insult to injury, now the Cook County Board chairman's going to get to make an appointment to Metra and the City of Chicago Cook County Board members are going to get to approve that appointment. That's not fair; that's not equitable. I think we can do better on this Bill because it's an important Bill. I am not antimass transit; I am pro mass transit. I need to see the ability to expand Metra services into McHenry County and into the areas of the region that don't have adequate mass transit. But the only way we can get a transit Bill that is fair and equitable is if we include capital. If we include the capital that it takes to expands those transit services..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your time has expired. Would you bring your remarks to a close."

Tryon: "Absolutely. If we include the capital Bill into the transit Bill or we do them together, I think we could put together a package that we all could vote on, that would be good not only for the City of Chicago but for suburban Cook, for McHenry County and for the rest of the state. I think we need to vote this Bill down today and continue to pressure the Leadership in this chamber for a capital transit Bill. Thank You."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I stand in opposition to this Bill because it is not dealing with the entire state. This Bill is fatally flawed because we have a system that is completely out of whack. The people that are riding the CTA buses need to know that the

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

lowest paid job seems to be those who clean the buses and clean the trains, and they start at twenty-six dollars (\$26) an hour plus benefits. Is that anyway to run an efficient mass transit system? I... I posit that it is not. We're not asking them to compete, as the private market in other cities. London changed much of their public transit over to private companies to compete and they drove so many more efficiencies that now they have twice as many buses running in London and they're running at a lower cost to the rider. What we have is a public monopoly, and until we break that system we're going to continue to shovel money into the Chicago system. I would also point out that the other two (2) leading cities in the United States, New York City and Los Angeles, subsidized their mass transit, New York City to the tune of two hundred and seventy million dollars (\$270,000,000) a year, Los Angeles more than three hundred million dollars (\$300,000,000) a year. What does the City of Chicago, out of its budget, give to their mass transit? They give five million (5,000,000), a total of five million (5,000,000) and Cook County is generous and adds another two (2,000,000), whereas New York and L.A. almost three hundred dollars (\$300)... three hundred million dollars (\$300,000,000) a piece. What we're doing is, we are doing another short-term fix. As Representative Tryon said, We'll be back here by August because the wheels are going to be falling off the CTA and the Metra trains. Well, Gentlemen and Ladies of this House, it seems that the train is leaving the station. What I'm going to ask you to do is to stand in front of that train. If four (4) or five

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

(5) of you have the guts to stand up to the Leadership and say, this is not the way to handle Illinois's economy. We need jobs all over the state, we need highways all over the state. We need improvements in state buildings, we need improvements in passenger rail not just in Chicagoland but throughout the state. I can guarantee you if this bai... Bill fails, we will be back within one (1) week with a capital Bill and a funding source. It simply takes the guts to say 'no'. I urge you to say 'no' and to ...help us get jobs throughout the state, not just in the Chicagoland area. With that, I ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Well, first, just to clarify. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady will yield. Indicates she'll yield."

Mathias: "I just want to clarify for the record the difference between the Amendment that was adopted and the previous Bill. Could you just go over that one more time what was... what the changes are?"

Hamos: "Do you mean from the Bill... the Amendment from this morning?"

Mathias: "No, from the last time when we voted on this Bill."

Hamos: "Okay. So..."

Mathis: "If we remember back then."

Hamos: "Well... well, we have called, just to tree... retrace the of history a little bit here. We voted for Senate Bill 572 on September 4. We later voted for Senate Bill 307 on November 28. In between that time, there were a number of

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

requests made to us specifically by your Leader to make some changes. For example, one of those was the Metra board changing it from the previous boundaries to the township boundaries. We... so, we made that change. We now have... we have in there that the RTA chairman must be appoint... elected by at least two (2) from each subdistrict of the... of the RTA. We have in there that every collar county... each collar gets one (1) appointment, that each collar county chairman gets one (1) appointment with confirmation of their entire board. That's true for the That was different in the earlier RTA and the Metra. And then, we also have pushed version, if you remember. back the reforms related to the CTA pension and retiree health care system by six (6) months because we've delayed now passing this Bill. We have to increase the amount required to be deposited for the pension obligation bond from initially one billion and four hundred and fifty million (1,450,000,000), if you remember, for pensions and retiree health care. We've increased that. We... Pace will... we will change... we will tweak the amount that Pace receives for South Suburban job access programs because again a phase-in for '08 and then full implementation in '09. We... we will have continuing appropriations for both funds for northeastern Illinois as well as funds for the Downstate Transportation Fund. We are changing back the downstate reimbursement rate to 65 percent, that was in the previous version of 572, so that's a shift from 307. collapsing Madison County Transportation District to become part of the Downstate Fund and we changed that real estate

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

transfer tax and then we took out the DuPage County additional use."

Mathias: "Thank you for that. And to the Bill. First, I'd like to thank Representative Hamos. After the last Bill, obviously, there were not a lot of Republicans votes on the Bill the last time this came up for a vote, but yet, even in spite of that, you worked with... with myself and the committee and the Republicans to make the Bill a better Bill, regardless of how the vote turns out, that you always work us on a bipartisan manner on this Bill and I appreciate that. I am going to support this Bill as I did last time. The reason we're here today is because it's all started with a deficit in the CTA. And because of that deficit, obviously, as time progressed, there was also a deficit in Metra and Pace. This is not strictly a CTA. But the reason we're really initially this came up was the CTA deficit. So in my own mind I know that there is still going to be a capital deficit for the CTA, Metra, and Pace and because CTA is an integral part of that, I have no doubt that the same reasons why we're here voting to... to vote for the operating expenses, we will need to be back here to vote for a jobs Bill for capital. And so that's why I know I would prefer that these are linked together, but the immediate crisis, today's crisis is operating expenses. We're going to take care of that. Tomorrow's crisis will be jobs and the capital Bill and we'll have to take care of it because otherwise the CTA won't be able to use the operating expenses we got today without wheels on their trains. So, I urge an 'aye' vote."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. I rise in support of this legislation. I want to commend Representative Hamos and the Members of the Mass Transit Committee for three (3) years of incredible work that they have put into this legislation. that was done is one of the largest audits ever undertaken by the Auditor General's Office. And when it came out it was stories and full page runs of the different problems that had occurred throughout the system, going from the employee health insurance to the pension systems to the structures in which the beneficiaries of the pension and the benefit increases were voting on increases in benefits without any increase in cost on the system and what that dragged it down. In the course of the three (3) years, the Bill that's before you addresses of the most recommendations from our state's most extensive audit to date. And the Representative is in earnest trying to solve a problem which on the 20, this is the newest deadline date, will become a reality for about four hundred thousand (400,000) people, who generally don't pay any attention to State Government, do not care what we do here. They care that when they hit a light switch the lights come on, when they walk out of their house to get on a bus or a train to go to work, it's there. In the course of doing this Bill, Representative and the Members brought downstate's Members to look at some of the transit needs going to have. we're There's a continuing appropriation and it will allow those fifteen (15) new

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

downstate paratransit units to come into operation and they will have capital for the first time where they actually go out and purchase buses, equipment, for the disabled in the community and provide those services. is a truly regional fix with a funding source to fix a regional problem that's been brought on by years upon years of mismanagement and it addresses a major issue for a huge economic strength of our state. They produce a lot of money, the people use the mass transit to get to work, and we all benefit from that. So, our downstate Members will see benefits. It is a stable, recurring funding source and we may have to address some problems later on, but that's what we do here. So, I want to commend the Sponsor for probably one of the most thorough pieces of legislation that I've seen come out of here in last seventeen (17) years and for the work that has been put into it, and all of the Members of the Transit Committee. I think this should be sent on and it's time that we assist a region to fix the problems that have been created there. It's a whole lot better than the last Bill that you had here, Representative, which had no funding source and created a four hundred million dollar (\$400,000,000) hole that would take a cigarette tax to keep it even. So, you did great on this round. I stand in support of it. I commend you and your committee for your work and this Bill should become law."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Reis: "Representative, just a couple of clarification questions. The Governor's been very choice in his words, saying, 'Please send us a Bill that I can sign or one that I can rewrite.' Is there any provisions in here that the Governor cannot rewrite this Bill and just write in 307, which he says he endorsed?"

Hamos: "Well, I don't know enough about executive authority to fully understand that. He has..."

Reis: "You're not the only one."

Hamos: "...he has been... Yeah, he has been making some noises that he wants to tinker with whatever Bill we send him."

Reis: "Okay. In all fairness, some clarifications on here and I sat in on some of your mass transit meetings this summer. Are there any... isn't there a Federal Law that says if you increase taxes by a certain amount that there has to be a dollar-for-dollar match in fare increases? And there were some provisions in your original Bill that we voted on in September that said that we recognize that Federal Law, but we're going to phase it in over ten (10) years. What... where does it stand now after seventeen (17) Amendments on what we're voting on now?"

Hamos: "At the re... I don't blame you for asking because we have had a lot Amendments. At the request of some of your Members and your Leader, we shortened that time from a tenyear phase-in to a five-year phase-in and that means that there will be a fare increase earlier, maybe not this year but relatively soon, there will be a fare increase to match that 50 percent farebox recovery ratio requirement."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Reis: "So, after five (5) years then, we will have increased fares by three hundred and eighty-five million (385,000,000)..."

Hamos: "Well..."

Reis: "...the same as the tax increase on the... on the ...that you're implementing with this legislation?"

Hamos: "It's a little… it's a little bit technical and I don't even understand this, but the five-year phase-in is the way that the dollars are accounted for the new revenues. The fare increase we are expecting would be before five (5) years, possibly in 2010, is the latest I heard."

Reis: "Okay. I rode the Metra trains in from the suburbs when I worked in Chicago. I've also ridden the train system in Washington, D.C. People ask me why don't we go to a system where the longer you ride the train, the more you charge, which is only fair for the people that ride longer. Has anyone looked into that, to make the fares truly ...represent how long a person's on a train or a bus?"

Hamos: "Well, I totally support that and actually when Representative Bassi said that she and I had been working on this for our full... this is our tenth year, we have had many hearings, one doing about some of these innovations. What would be required to effectuate that is, I believe, a capital change. They would need capital dollars to put a place at the front end and the back end of a ride where you would swath or you would have to put your... your ticket into, so that it could measure how far you went and right now we don't have that kind of system in place. That would

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

need a retrofit and they've always said that that would be a lot of money."

Reis: "And I'm glad you bring up capital, and that brings me to my last question. The city system has what we call down on the farm, they've mined their assets. They haven't bought new wheels, they haven't bought new buses, they haven't bought new cars, they haven't kept up their train tracks. Is there any provisions in this Bill, that's supposed to be reforming a lot of things, that kind of spells out that they have to spend so much of this on capital improvements each year? They cannot just keep putting money that's put into a system to help alleviate a doomsday scenario if they don't keep up their capital purchases in the future. And I think that's what got them in trouble. So, does this Bill address that in any way?"

Hamos: "Well, Representative, let me say first of all that I agree with you and with many Members on your side and our side that we need a capital Bill, including for transit. I would like to say that the worst thing that has happened in the past three (3) years since I've been chair of this committee is that they... since haven't had enough dollars just to make the buses and the rail run, they've had to actually take money from capital and put it into operating."

Reis: "Exactly."

Hamos: "So, it's the opposite direction; that's a terrible practice. That means that they've been forcibly raiding their maintenance funds, their precious maintenance funds, just to make their budget work. This year..."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Reis: "So, all we're going to do with this is pour more money into it."

Hamos: "Well..."

Reis: "Are they going use that for operating too, or are they going to...?"

Hamos: "No. They got... they get money from the Federal Government for capital; they'd like to use it for capital and not divert it to operating. And secondly, if they have enough money from this, even this Bill, to do those maintenance and capital repairs, they would love to do that. So that's a..."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your time has expired. Would you bring your remarks to a close? Do you wish her... why don't you finish the question, Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Yeah, I believe that's just a function of how much they have in their operating budget. They know they have maintenance and repair needs; they'd love to spend it on those kinds of... of funding needs."

Reis: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, you finished? The Gentleman for Kendall, Representative Cross."

Reis: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Thank you."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have any questions.

I... find this to be a rather interesting day. I want to preface all of my comments with... make it very clear that there's no question we need to resolve the mass transit problem in northeastern Illinois. And I want to applaud Representative Hamos, she spent a lot of time on this and

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

so have Representatives Mathias, and Bassi, and Mulligan, It's very important to them and they're and Coulson. passionate about it. They've been very concerned about this issue from day one, and I want to thank them for their leadership and their tenacity on the issue. It's a very emotional issue. But what strikes me about today and the kind of the absurd nature of today is a little while ago we passed a Bill or you passed a Bill ...doesn't surprise us, I guess, you followed the wishes of your Governor, to pass a Bill the shortfall almost four hundred million dollars (\$400,000,000) out of the General Revenue Fund. Now, we talked about that idea, it came out of our side, several months ago in an attempt to compromise, but when we talked about it, we talked about making sure that we filled that hole 'cause we acknowledged that there was going to a shortfall by taking the sales tax off gas to help solve the CTA problem. Unfortunately, today under the Bill you passed, all of you, your upstate and downstate Members, you didn't address the shortfall, the hole in the budget at all. Completely ignored it. No reference to it, no suggestion that we need to fill it, just simply, well, this is what the Governor wanted and we're going to send it to him, heck with a four hundred million dollar (\$400,000,000) hole. I guess we really shouldn't be surprised. It was the same Party, the same group on your side of the aisle that shorted the pension system for four (4) years to balance a budget, spending money we didn't have. there's some good things in this Bill that we're talking about now under the Hamos Bill. Again, we need to solve

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

the mass transit problem and I somewhat argue that this is probably the best way to do it. And I in some ways I agree with that. But again, what adds to the confusion and the problem of today is you do kind of the same old game of putting in some things we need, but taking an underhanded approach to some other things. Here's an opportunity today to maybe help some of the other counties, help DuPage County. You've got a piece of legislation that you threw out today to say, DuPage County, you're going through some tough times, we understand that. We're going to take a quarter percent increase in the sales tax and allow you to use it for public safety, but now five (5) hours later you yank that out and decide that we're not going to give them that. We're going to focus on one thing and one thing only and that is to take care of the City of Chicago because it's January 1 and we don't need to work with the other side of the aisle. Let's do the typical thing we've been doing for the last six (6) years under a Democratcontrolled House, a Democrat-controlled Senate, a Democratcontrolled Governor's Office and take care of only certain parts of the state at the expense of the rest of the State of Illinois. It's the Chicago power grab. It's really not a surprise to any of us. We've changed this Bill from a governance standpoint to give the county board chairman, Todd Stroger, who we all know, I like Todd. Hasn't had a great record since he's been the county board president. We're now going to give the Cook County board president an appointment to the Metra board and to the RTA board, take care of DuPage County... or take care of Cook County but not

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

DuPage. We're not going to take care of DuPage. We're only taking care of Cook County and the City of Chicago. We're also now going to change the governance provision to say that for suburban Cook folks we have the ability to appoint members to RTA and specifically Metra. We're going to allow you to do that, but not without the City of Chicago members on the Cook County Board, who represent the City of Chicago, to have a say. Once again, we want to take care of the City of Chicago, the City of Chicago only. Is that really the spirit of bipartisanship? Is that what we're all about? Is that working together? Of course not. And that's the sad reality of what's going on here, something that has to be done. This is probably going to pass, and quite frankly, we need to do something on mass transit. But the way it's been done, the protection of certain segments of this state and population at expense of others and the totality of today is a huge mistake. Now, the other extremely significant or in... significant part that's lacking in today's debate and issue is we've only done half ... solved half of the problem, half the problem. We've taken care of one need and acknowledged... and we all knew that has to happen, but we have completely ignored a jobs Bill, a capital Bill, an infrastructure Bill. Does anybody understand, if you don't you should, that all that work on 355-South, all that work on the Dan Ryan, all that work on the tollway system is It's dried up. Gone, finished. Housing market isn't particularly strong right now in this country and certainly not in the State of Illinois. We have an

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

opportunity in this state to infuse ten (10) to twenty (20) billion dollars (\$10,000,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000) into our economy, to build schools, to improve state buildings, to widen roads, to lengthen roads from Cairo to Waukegan, from Quincy to Danville, but we haven't done it. haven't done it. We've done half the problem, taken care of one half the problem and then completely ignored the real... the bigger issue, I think, maybe not the bigger but equally as important, as the first issue... we're not doing anything about a jobs Bill. We're completely ignoring the needs of all of the people of the State of Illinois. Taking care of part it, but not all of it. Ron Huerberman has been quoted, he's been in committee, says we have almost six billion dollars (\$6,000,000,000) of needs of capital in the CTA system. Trains slow down to five (5) miles an hour in the City of Chicago 'cause the rail system is so bad. We need new tires on those ... or wheels on those trains; we need to make improvements. The list goes on and I've been told by all the Leaders of the Legislative Caucuses that they want a jobs Bill. I'll take them at their word. I've taken them at their word for a year now. But I'll continue to take them at their word because the reality is we need to do a jobs Bill. And I will give... and I haven't done this lately... I will give the Governor credit. He has said he's for a jobs Bill and I take him at his word. He's been very tenacious and been very committed to a jobs Bill and I believe him. But we can talk a lot about this and we can take care of a component of it today, but we will be doing a disservice to all of the people of

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

the State of Illinois, regardless of where they live and to those looking for jobs, if we don't complete the picture, if we don't do the thing we need to do soon, not later, because we're about to lose federal money. You know what's going in D.C. now, they're saying, we're working on a highway Bill out there. Well, why should we give Illinois more money? Why do we want to give the Legislature and the Department of Transportation, the State of Illinois any more money for a transportation Bill 'cause they haven't even accessed the money we sent them from several years ago? Why would anybody give us any money right now? Our inaction is going to cause us a lot of pain and a lot of hurt. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and I appreciate this commitment, and I believe sincerity on your part Representative Hamos, in pursuing this and the four (4) Members on our side who I know have worked hard on this. I appreciate it. But our job's not complete. I'm saddened by some of things that have gone on today, but that happens, when you're not in control and you've got a Majority in all the... in the House and the Senate and I quess the Governor's Office. Hopefully, the people of this state, especially those downstate, will see what happened today. And I know that people will vote what they think is best for their districts. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Soto."

Soto: "Yes, Speaker. I'd like to move to the previous question."

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And Representative Hamos, you're recognized to close."

"Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill, Senate Hamos: Bill 572, we've had really excellent debate today and previous times as well. This is a comprehensive long-term solution to the regional transit system. It combines funding with reform. More importantly, it is a regional solution to a regional problem. That's where I think we... some other approaches have fallen down on that, but this is a regional solution. It is also an approach to reform of the RTA that is intended to create an integrated and accountable regional transit system. The one response I really feel the need to make that I take personally is what the Leader, the previous speaker, the Leader said that I really want to challenge. I am a suburban Legislator. I take very seriously a responsibility to be a regional leader, that is how I consider myself. I had no interest, whatsoever in creating a Bill which was a CTA bailout. This is not a CTA bailout. In fact, the governance changes we made were intended to create a fair and balanced regional transit system. We increased on the RTA board the number of collar county representatives from three (3) to five (5). And you know, we actually went from eleven (11) members to sixteen (16) members and we created more balance by giving the city, the suburbs and the collar counties equal voice. That has never happened in twenty-four (24) years. The CTA has always been in power at the RTA. We

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

turned that into a balanced organization. On Metra, we increased again the number of collar county representatives so that each and every collar county has a voice on that board. This is not intended to be a CTA bailout and that's not what this is. This is comprehensive; this is long-term. As I said earlier, this has... this is fiscally responsible and it is a balanced approach. I'm very proud of this Bill. Please do not hold this Bill hostage to another agenda, an important agenda, but not one that's before us today. I really ask you for a strong 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate The question is, 'Shall this pass?' All in Bill 572. favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Represent... Okay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes' and 52 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. All riaht. Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 10 at the hour of 11:00 a.m. So, all in favor of the Lady's Motion sav 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 11:00 a.m."

Clerk Bolin: "House Perfunctory Session for the regular Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions.

Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 818, offered by Representative Beiser. House Resolution 828, offered by Representative Holbrook. House Resolution 840, offered by

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Representative D'Amico. House Resolution 850, offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 853, offered by Representative Will Davis. House Resolution 859, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 862, offered by Representative Mendoza. House Resolution 865, offered by Representative Franks. House Resolution 869, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 875, offered by Representative Holbrook. House Resolution 880, offered by Representative Franks. House Joint Resolution 81, offered by Representative Brauer. And House Joint Resolution 82, offered by Representative Fortner. These Resolutions are referred to the House Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #30, offered by Representative Lindner.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Article IV of the Illinois Constitution by changing Section 6 as follows:

### ARTICLE IV

### THE LEGISLATURE

### SECTION 6. ORGANIZATION

- (a)A majority of the members elected to each house constitutes a quorum.
- (b) On the first day of the January session of the General Assembly in odd-numbered years, the Secretary of State

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

shall convene the House of Representatives to elect from its membership a Speaker of the House of Representatives as presiding officer, and the Governor shall convene the Senate to elect from its membership a President of the Senate as presiding officer. A person may not serve more than a total of 10 years in either or both of the offices of Speaker of the House of Representatives and President of the Senate; provided that service before the second Wednesday in January of 2010 shall not be considered in the calculation of a person's service.

- (c) For purposes of powers of appointment conferred by this Constitution, the Minority Leader of either house is a member of the numerically strongest political party other than the party to which the Speaker or the President belongs, as the case may be.
- (d) Each house shall determine the rules of its proceedings, judge the elections, returns and qualifications of its members and choose its officers. No member shall be expelled by either house, except by a vote of two-thirds of the members elected to that house. A member may be expelled only once for the same offense. Each house may punish by imprisonment any person, not a member, guilty of disrespect to the house by disorderly or contemptuous behavior in its presence. Imprisonment shall not extend beyond twenty-four hours at one time unless the person persists in disorderly or contemptuous behavior.

### SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. This has been First Reading of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. Correction. House Bill 4263, offered by Bill 41... Reis, a Bill for Representative an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4264, offered by Representative Ryg, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4265, offered by Representative Beaubien, a Bill for an Act concerning financial regulation. House Bill 4266, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 4267, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Bill 4268, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4269, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for a Bill for an Act concerning ammunition. House Bill 4270, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4271, offered Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 4272, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 4273, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 4274, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 4275, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 4276, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act in relation to

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

public employee benefits. House Bill 4277, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4278, offered Representative Graham, a Bill for an Act concerning State services. House Bill 4279, offered by Representative Cole, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4280, offered by Representative Cole, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4281, offered Representative Cole, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 4282, offered by Representative Cole, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 4283, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4284, offered by Representative Boland, a Bill for an Act concerning support. House Bill 4285, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 4286, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 4287, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 4288, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning legislative member initiatives. House Bill 4289, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4290, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4291, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Bill 4292, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 4293, offered by

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 4294, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4295, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 4296, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for concerning civil law. House Bill 4297, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning license House Bill 4298, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee House Bill 4299, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee House Bill 4300, offered by Representative benefits. Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4301, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 4302, offered by Representative Will Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4303, offered by Representative Froehlich, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4304, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4305, offered by Representative Ramey, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. House Bill 4306, offered by Representative Ramey, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 4307, offered by Representative Eddy, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. House Bill 4308, offered by Representative Kosel, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4309, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning

205th Legislative Day

1/9/2008

education. House Bill 4310, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 4311, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 4312, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 4313, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Bill 4314, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. House Bill 4315, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 4316, offered Representative Lyons, Bill for an Act concerning a regulation. House Bill 4317, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4318, offered by Representative Sullivan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. First Reading of these House Having no further business, the House Perfunctory Bills. Session for the regular Session will stand adjourned until Thursday, January 10, at 11 a.m."